

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

TRANSMITTAL
FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)


Total Number of Pages in This Submission

| | | |
|------------------------|------------------|--|
| Application Number | 10/700,078 | RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER DEC 08 2005 |
| Filing Date | November 3, 2003 | |
| First Named Inventor | Bridgewater | |
| Art Unit | 1714 | |
| Examiner Name | Vickey Ronesi | |
| Attorney Docket Number | A01463 | |

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)


| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form | <input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached | <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers | <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply | <input type="checkbox"/> Petition | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> After Final | <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application | <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation | <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request | <input type="checkbox"/> Change of Correspondence Address | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below): |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request | <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer | <i>Interview Summary</i> |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement | <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application | <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53 | <input type="checkbox"/> Remarks | |

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

| | | | |
|--------------|---|----------|--------|
| Firm Name | Rohm and Haas Company | | |
| Signature |  | | |
| Printed name | Robert W. Stevenson | | |
| Date | 12/8/05 | Reg. No. | 31,064 |

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

| | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|---------|
| Signature |  | | |
| Typed or printed name | Janice Soulas | Date | 12-8-05 |

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

BY FAX:

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Atty Docket No.: A01463

In re application of: Brian Michael Bridgewater et al. Confirmation No. 3734

Serial No.: 10/700,078 Group Art Unit: 1714

Filed: November 3, 2003 Examiner: Vickey Ronesi

For: Aqueous Coating Composition Comprising Emulsion Polymer Formed In The Presence Of Thermal Initiator And Neutralizer

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Interview Summary

On Dec 8th, 2005, the undersigned and Matthew S. Gebhard conducted an interview with Examiners Vickey Ronesi and Vasu Jagannathan regarding the Advisory Action of November 25, 2005.

Application No. 10/700,078 describes data obtained by a scrub resistance test. The applicants reference the standard test procedure, ASTM D 2486-00, attached (Exhibit A), with respect to this test in the Specification (page 6, paragraph 0044). ASTM D 2486-00 is widely used throughout the paint and coatings industry.

The applicants referred to the full written test procedure to show that the scrub resistance test is a wet abrasion test which involves wearing through the entire thickness of the coating until the substrate becomes clearly visible. After reviewing the test procedure, the Examiners concluded that there is indeed a dry film thickness dependence on the number of scrub cycles required to reach the endpoint of the test. Thus in comparing data between waterborne polymer compositions, the dry film thickness needs to be kept constant between samples.

The Examiners therefore stated that it was in error to state in the Advisory Action that "scrub resistance is a property of a coating and not the bulk."

We pointed out that for a valid comparison of scrub resistance between two wet polymer compositions, the compositions need to be applied at equal wet film thickness to provide dry films of equal film thickness, but that this could only occur if the rheology profile was the same between samples. Because different polymer compositions can have different responses to rheology modifiers, it is inevitable that slightly different quantities of rheology modifiers are required in order to produce applied films of equal wet film thickness.

To ensure optimal comparisons in scrub resistance data between different polymer compositions, the applicants adjusted rheology of the wet compositions in order to provide dry films of equal film thickness in the comparisons previously noted of record. This is the standard procedure in the industry since it provides a better comparison than comparing films of unequal film thickness.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert W. Stevenson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 31,064
Telephone No.: 215-592-2171

December 8, 2005
Rohm and Haas Company
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399